UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,895	01/16/2004	Guy Eden	SLA1496	8472

7590 07/30/2007

Law Office of Gerald Maliszewski
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829

EXAMINER	
SAN JUAN, MARTINJERIKO P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,895	EDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Martin Jeriko P. San Juan	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *5/29/2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a response to Applicant's response filed on May 29, 2007.

Claims 1-34 are pending.

Claims 1, 6, 13-4, 17, 18, 30-31, and 34 are currently amended.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and they are persuasive.

Applicant's new oath and new drawings are acceptable.

Applicant's amendments to Specifications with regard to changes in new drawings are acceptable.

Response to Argument

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, pages 13-22, filed on May 29, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-34 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Morgan et al. [US PN 5220674] in combination with previous cited prior art Wiegley [US PN 6711677 B1], and Konsella et al. [US PN 6856317 B2].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. [US PN 5220674], and further in view of Wiegley [US PN 6711677 B1] and Konsella et al. [US PN 6856317 B2].

Regarding Claim 1, Morgan et al. teaches a method for network-connected resources, the method comprising: at a first network-connected node, receiving an unencrypted electronically formatted job [US PN 5220674, Col 6, Ln 55-58] and using a resource to process the job [US PN 5220674, Col 7, Ln 24-29]. Morgan et al. does not teach receiving CK, a symmetrical encryption key (K) encrypted using an asymmetrical encryption public key (pubK); receiving CH, a hash (H) of the job, further encrypted using K; decrypting CK using an asymmetrical encryption private key (privK), corresponding to pubK, to recover K; hashing the job, generating H'; using K to validate CH.

Weigley teaches a secure printing method comprising: receiving CK [session key – US PN 6711677 B1, Col 4, Ln 49], a symmetrical encryption key (K) encrypted using an asymmetrical encryption public key (pubK) [encrypted session key with printer public key – US PN 6711677 B1, Col 4, Ln 54]; receiving CH, a hash (H) of the job, further encrypted using K [compute hash value for print data, encrypt hash value using session key – US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 32]; decrypting CK using an asymmetrical encryption private key (privK), corresponding to pubK, to recover K [printer decrypts session key using its private key – US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 4]; hashing the job, generating H' [printer computes hash value of print data -- US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 36]; using K to validate CH [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 36-39];

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add cryptographic security as taught by Weigley in the method of using network-connected resources of Morgan et al. because there is no security precautions in the method of Morgan et al. The suggestion/motivation for combining would have been to provide security to the access and use of network-connected resources by validating the print job [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 2, Ln 35-53] that would essentially access and use the resource. Morgan et al. and Weigley are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor involving printing systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Morgan et al. and Weigley.

Konsella et al. teaches a system and method for storing public and secure font data in a font file which is a form of printing resources comprising: in response to a validation of use, decrypting an encrypted resource using a decryption key [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 4, Ln 44-56].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add cryptographic security as taught by Konsella et al. in the actual use of network-connected resources of Morgan et al. because these secure font files can be stored easily in the printer server's internal collection of resources. The suggestion/motivation for combining would have been to provide security to the use of network-connected resources such as fonts and glyphs [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 2, Ln 1-50] and for ease of maintaining these secured resources [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 5, Ln 30-40]. Morgan et al. and Konsella et al. are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor involving printing systems that also solves the problem of security. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Morgan et al. and Konsella et al.

It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Konsella et al. invention's decryption key to be the same as Weigley's symmetrical key because the same symmetrical key can be used in the same job session. The suggestion/motivation for combining would have been to provide security in the exchange of a key between two nodes as it is well

known in the art as dual keys systems [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 1, Ln 19-26]. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the inventions of Weigley and Konsella et al.

Regarding claim 2, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 wherein using K to validate CH includes:
encrypting H' using K, obtaining CH'; and, matching CH to CH' [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 36-39 -- This method claim is an obvious variant of claim 3. H is inherent in CH using the symmetrical key, K.].

Regarding claim 3, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 wherein using K to validate CH includes: decrypting CH using K, generating H ; and, comparing H to H' [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 36-39].

Regarding claim 4, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: prior to receiving the job, CK, and CH, receiving the encrypted resource; and storing the encrypted resource [US 6856317 B2, Col 5, Ln 36].

Regarding claim 5, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising: installing pubK,

privK upon initialization [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 4, Ln 31-34].

Regarding claim 6, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 wherein receiving the unencrypted electronically formatted job includes receiving a print job in a format selected from the group including text and image formats [US PN 5220674, Col 6, Ln 58-61].

Regarding claim 7, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 4 wherein storing the encrypted resource includes storing an encrypted font resource [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 5, Ln 32-36]; and wherein using the decrypted resource to process the job includes printing a print job using the decrypted fonts [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 5, Ln 5-6].

Regarding claim 8, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 7 wherein storing the encrypted font resource includes storing resources selected from the group including a logo, personal signature image, and glyph [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 2, Ln 54-62].

Regarding claim 9, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 4 wherein receiving the encrypted resource includes receiving the encrypted resource in a format selected from the group including hypertext transport protocol (http) and file transport protocol

(FTP) [US PN 6856317 B2, Col 5, Ln 30-40 -- Konsella et al. teaches distributing secure font data files including emailing to recipients which implies an internet network connection. HTTP and FTP are standard internet protocols for communicating data in the internet, as such, these protocols are inherent.].

Regarding claim 10, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: at a second network-connected node, generating the job [US PN 5220674, Col 6, Ln 55-58]; encrypting K with pubK, generating CK [encrypted session key with printer public key – US PN 6711677 B1, Col 4, Ln 54]; hashing the job, generating H [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 32]; encrypting H using K, generating CH [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 32]; and, sending the job, CK, and CH to the first node for job processing [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 5, Ln 32-34].

Regarding claim 11, the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: receiving a selection command for a particular one of a plurality of encrypted resources; and, wherein decrypting an encrypted resource using K, in response to a valid match, includes decrypting the selected resource. [US PN 5220674, Col 7, Ln 23-29 – Since the printer can determine whether a specific resource is available for the print job, these claim limitations are inherent.]

Regarding claim 12, Konsella et al. teaches a unique decryption key for a

particular secure font file [Col 5, Ln 3-6]. Morgan et al. teaches a system for storing a plurality of resources [Col 7, Ln 23-29]. Wiegley teaches the use of encrypted symmetric keys [US PN 6711677 B1, Col 4, Ln 54]. The method of claim 11, wherein receiving a selection command for a particular one of a plurality of encrypted resources includes receiving CK_i, where $1 \leq i \leq m$; and, wherein decrypting the selected resource in response to the encrypted resource selection command includes decrypting CK_i to recover one of symmetrical encryption keys K_1 through K_m, where K_1 through K_m correspond to encrypted resources CR_1 through CR_m will be inherent from the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al.

Regarding claim 13, Morgan et al. teaches a system with a plurality of printers [Fig 1, Itm 16a and 16b]. The method of claim 1 wherein receiving the unencrypted electronically formatted job includes receiving the job at network-connected node N_i, where $1 \leq i \leq n$; wherein receiving CK includes N_i receiving CK_i, where CK_i is generated by encrypting K using corresponding asymmetrical encryption public key $pubK_i$; and, wherein decrypting CK includes N_i decrypting CK_i using corresponding asymmetrical encryption private key $privK_i$, to recover K will be inherent from the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al.

Regarding claim 14, Morgan et al. teaches a system with a plurality of printers and printer clients [Fig 1, Itm 16a and 16b, Itm 18a and 18b]. The method of

claim 1 wherein receiving the unencrypted electronically formatted job includes receiving the job at network-connected node N_i, where $1 \leq i \leq n$; wherein receiving CK includes N_i receiving CK_i, corresponding to symmetrical encryption key K_i, encrypted using $pubK_i$; wherein receiving CH includes N_i receiving CH_i, a hash of the job encrypted using corresponding symmetrical encryption key K_i; and wherein decrypting CK includes N_i decrypting CK_i using asymmetrical encryption private key $privK_i$, to recover corresponding symmetrical encryption key K_i will be inherent from the combined inventions of Morgan et al., Wiegley, and Konsella et al.

Claim 15 has the same limitations as claim 2 with the accommodation of the plurality of network-connected nodes on both ends, N_i, where $1 \leq i \leq n$. Claim 15 is rejected because of inherency while using the same references and rationale of claims 14, and 2.

Claim 16 has the same limitations as claim 3 with the accommodation of the plurality of network-connected nodes on both ends, N_i, where $1 \leq i \leq n$. Claim 16 is rejected because of inherency while using the same references and rationale of claims 14, and 3.

Claim 17 is rejected using the same references as claim 10. Claim 17 limitations are identical to claim 10 except it is a method of accessing network-connected processing resources. [Morgan et al. teaches a printing system having a printer

server with digital data processing devices on one end, and printer devices on the other end. US PN 5220674, Col 3, Ln 26-40]

Claim 18 is rejected using the same references as claim 1. Claim 18 is merely a system performing the methods of claim 1.

Claims 19-33 are rejected using the same references and rationale claims 3-10 because claims 20-27 are the same system as claim 18 performing the additional methods of claims 2-16.

Claim 34 is rejected using the same reference and rationale as claim 17 because claim 34 is the system performing the method of claim 17.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Jeriko P. San Juan whose telephone number is 571-272-7875. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30a - 6:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJSJ

GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100